

BOOK WORLD
The Washington Post
12 May 1968

STAT

Kim Philby of Her Majesty's Secret

THE PHILBY CONSPIRACY. By Bruce Page, Phillip Knightley and David Leitch. Illustrated. Doubleday. 312 pp. \$5.95.

By Thomas W. Braden

Aghast, one puts down *The Philby Conspiracy*. The joint product of a team of journalists working for the London *Sunday Times*, it is the most sustained, the most horrifying and the best account of international espionage that has been written, at least since Rebecca West's *The Meaning of Treason*.

The mind searches for reassurance. Finding none, it springs to self-defense. "Thou shalt not bear false witness," it recalls. One would not have known such a man, he could not have been in the circle of one's friends.

But the exercise is fruitless. Kim Philby was in the circle of one's friends, not in the close sense of "what friends thou hast and their endurance tried" — he was never that to anyone, not even to his wife — a fact which might go unnoticed only in a secret service where amicable disengagement is also good security. But one had a drink with Philby at the house of friends. Because he was the personification of the alliance, Her Majesty's representative on matters "most secret," one greeted him in the office of the boss rather more cheerily than one might greet a fellow member of "the firm."

One was guarded of course. The boss would raise the subject about which the representative of the British Secret Intelligence Service had a "need to know." Still, one thought that Philby was on friendly terms with all the senior partners, that he had more access to the carefully compartmentalized secrets of the various divisions of the firm than any of the firm's junior executives.

So where does the mind come out? It is at last forced to face an abasing truth: that it is possible for a man to accept from those with whom he walks all that they can give in affection, well-being, education, trust and honor, and in return lie to them, steal from them, betray them, even murder them.

Now, in 1968, after Hiss, after Nunn May, after Fuchs and Blake, after Burgess and Maclean — who play secondary roles in *The Philby Conspiracy* — the case of H. A. R. (Kim) Philby is still shocking.

It is shocking because Philby had none of the weaknesses or oddities which might cause acquaintance to pause on the brink of confidence. He was not a drunk (Maclean) or homosexual (Burgess and Blake). He was not an adolescent egomaniac (Nunn May and Fuchs). He was not even passionate about austerity as Colonel Penkovskiy seemed passionate about luxury. Nor did Philby have any of the excuses by which the

Intelligence Service

sociologist or the psychologist will explain our misbehavior. He was not poor, not deformed, not a member of any group which other groups look upon as inferior.

But Philby is shocking for a more important reason. He is shocking because he grew up in a society which tolerates rebellion, even to some degree respects it. He betrayed this society to another which punishes rebellion with death. It is tempting to compare Philby with Penkovskiy. Both were intelligence officers, though on opposite sides. Both were traitors to their governments. But the temptation must be put aside. Penkovskiy rebelled in favor of conscience; Philby turned over his conscience to anti-conscience.

Philby grew to manhood at Cambridge as a student of economics and history during a time — the Thirties — when economics was not working very well and history seemed (as perhaps it does to the current college generation) to grow gloomier as it came closer. The authors of *The Philby Conspiracy* quote John Maynard Keynes, whose lectures the young Philby must have attended. Keynes deplored the tendency towards Communism among the young of that Cambridge era and attributed it to a "recrudescence of the strain of Puritanism in our blood, the zest to adopt a painful solution because of its painfulness."

But one can find little of the Puritan rebel in any other aspect of Philby's career, at Cambridge or later. Surely this university student who campaigned for

Labour with a speech about "the heart of England" beating "not in stately homes but in the factories and on the farms" would also have given thought to the place of the rebel in his society. He would have considered the challenge rebellion creates, or the changes it frequently brings. There is a place for the rebel in a free society. Philby cannot be granted that status. He was a traitor to conscience as well as to state.

So much for the shock imposed by the man. There are two more shocks presented by *The Philby Conspiracy*. Let us take them not in order of importance, but as they come.

The first is the shock of seeing the society of Great Britain as it took Philby and his co-conspirators to its bosom, nurtured them, protected them, drew them closer and refused to repel them in the face of obvious warnings that they were sucking its life blood.

Maclean, let it be repeated, was a drunk. Not merely a man who had one too many too often, but a gutter drunk, an angry, brawling drunk, a drunk found in the morning on the floor of